

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2001  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S011425      People, Respondent

v.

Ronald Harold Seaton, Appellant

The time for granting or denying rehearing in the above-entitled case is hereby extended to and including November 7, 2001, or the date upon which rehearing is either granted or denied, whichever occurs first.

S030416      People, Respondent

v.

Sergio Ochoa, Appellant

The time for granting or denying rehearing in the above-entitled case is hereby extended to and including September 26, 2001, or the date upon which rehearing is either granted or denied, whichever occurs first.

S086153      People, Respondent

4th Dist.      v.

E023001      Dominic Slayton, Respondent

Div. 2      The parties are hereby notified that the court proposes to take judicial notice of the attached documents, the complaint and information filed in the Riverside County Superior Court. This notice is provided pursuant to the provisions of Evidence Code, sections 459, subdivision (c) and 455, subdivision (a). If any party wishes to present information to the court relevant to the propriety of taking judicial notice of the matter and tenor of the matter to be noticed, such information shall be submitted to the court on or before August 31, 2001.

S012279      People, Respondent

v.

David Allan Lucas, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including October 2, 2001.

S027264 People, Respondent

v.

Jack Wayne Friend, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including October 2, 2001.

S044693 People, Respondent

v.

Randall Clark Wall, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including November 5, 2001, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to serve a copy of the record correction motion on the Supreme Court upon its filing in the trial court.

S091601 Roseanne Hooker, Appellant

v.

California Department of Transportation, Respondent

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file its answer to the amicus curiae brief of California Consumer Attorneys is extended to and including August 27, 2001.

S096088 Whitmore Union Elementary School District, Appellant

v.

County of Shasta et al., Respondents

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to and including September 14, 2001.

S096161 Joel Drouet, Petitioner

v.

San Francisco County Superior Court, Respondent

Jim Broustis et al., Real Parties in Interest

On application of real parties in interest and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to and including September 19, 2001.

S097104 Mary J. Jefferson, Appellant

v.

California Department of Youth Authority and  
Larry Berg, Respondents

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's answer brief on the merits is extended to and including October 1, 2001.

No further extensions of time will be granted.

S097456 Owen S. Price, Appellant

v.

Richard L. Clark et al., Respondents

On application of appellant and respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief is extended to and including September 14, 2001.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S097340 People, Respondent

v.

Jomo K. Bland, Appellant

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Mark Christensen is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits shall be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date respondent's opening brief on the merits is filed.

S097429 People, Respondent

v.

Brian T. Hill, Appellant

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Robert Bryzman is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending in this court.

S097857 People, Respondent

v.

Lonnie Johnson, Appellant

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Katharine Eileen Greenebaum is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits shall be served and filed on or

before thirty (30) days from the date respondent's opening brief on the merits is filed.

S010856 People, Respondent

v.

Albert Cunningham, Appellant

In the above-entitled matter, the court filed its decision on June 21, 2001, because of the following extraordinary and compelling circumstances:

1. A delay (for good cause) of several years in the filing of the briefs (appellant's opening brief was filed on April 3, 1996; appellant's supplemental opening brief was filed on July 29, 1996; respondent's brief was filed on January 6, 1997; appellant's reply brief was filed on August 4, 1997).

2. The number and complexity of the issues raised (4 briefs filed in all, totalling 1, 151 pages, raising approximately 77 separate issues).

3. The size of the record (more than 4,230 pages of reporter's transcript; more than 1,312 pages of clerk's transcript).

S097915 In re **Bruce Malcolm Brown** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Bruce Malcolm Brown, State Bar No. 135036**, be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct; and until he makes restitution to PattyLou Stults or Patrick M. Wilson (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$750 plus 10% interest per annum from February 1, 2001, and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. He is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on April 11, 2001. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* 1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) **Bruce Malcolm Brown** is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule

(within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7. \*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S098006 In re **Craig Michael Lytle** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Craig Michael Lytle, State Bar No. 84430**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 60 days. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed March 28, 2001, as modified by its order filed May 17, 2001. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002 and 2003. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S098008 In re **Charles T. Hindley** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Charles T. Hindley, State Bar No. 55738**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation, including one year actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on February 20, 2001, as modified by its order filed April 9, 2001. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Credit toward the period of actual suspension shall be given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on October 27, 1999 (*In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 270). Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

S098010 In re **Wayne Winrow** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Wayne Winrow, State Bar No. 153632**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for 30 months on condition that he be actually suspended for 75 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed April 11, 2001. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002 and 2003. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

S098146 In re **Ione Young Gray** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Ione Young Gray, State Bar No. 74491**, be suspended from the practice of law for five years and until she provides the showing required pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for four years on condition that she be actually suspended for four years and six months and until she has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Credit towards the period of actual suspension shall be given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on April 29, 1997. (*In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 270.) **Ione Young Gray** is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on March 16, 2001. It is also ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of her actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-quarter of said costs shall be added to and become part of the

membership fees for the years 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S098148 In re **Jack Raymond Cooney, Jr.** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Jack Raymond Cooney, Jr., State Bar No. 63980**, be suspended from the practice of law for five years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for four years on condition that he be actually suspended for two years and until he complies with standard 1.4(c)(ii). Respondent is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on April 20, 2001. It is also ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S099773 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Joseph Dichiaro, Jr.**  
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Joseph Dichiaro, Jr., State Bar No. 50397**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S099774 In the Matter of the Resignation of **Thomas Hauser Durff**  
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Thomas Hauser Durff, State Bar No. 43321**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted.

- S099776      In the Matter of the Resignation of **Grace Katherine Matuszeski**  
A Member of the State Bar of California  
The voluntary resignation of **Grace Katherine Matuszeski, State Bar No. 92843**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted.
- S099777      In the Matter of the Resignation of **Olaus J. Oppedahl**  
A Member of the State Bar of California  
The voluntary resignation of **Olaus J. Oppedahl, State Bar No. 47035**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted.
- S099778      In the Matter of the Resignation of **James Michael Ratcliffe**  
A Member of the State Bar of California  
The voluntary resignation of **James Michael Ratcliffe, State Bar No. 97840**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted.
- S099837      In the Matter of the Resignation of **Leo Bazile**  
A Member of the State Bar of California  
The voluntary resignation of **Leo Bazile, State Bar No. 75441**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.  
\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)
- S099838      In the Matter of the Resignation of **Steven Ray Jones**  
A Member of the State Bar of California  
The voluntary resignation of **Steven Ray Jones, State Bar No. 46843**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.  
\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)



S099840

In the Matter of the Resignation of **G. Dennis Adams**

A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **G. Dennis Adams, State Bar No. 37767**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)